

present invention, the process for cleaning is not optimized for each cylinder to be cleaned. If the cylinder is not completely clean after running the process shown in Fig. 4, the process is simply repeated. To the contrary, the present invention determines operating parameters of the cylinders to be cleaned, then determines the optimal wash sequence for each cylinder to be cleaned based on the operating parameters. The wash devices associated with the cylinders to be cleaned are controlled based on the optimal wash sequence. It was argued somewhat extensively that Iijima in no way suggests any of these limitations.

Somewhat surprisingly, the Examiner repeats the comments made in his previous Office Action without addressing Applicants' arguments. It appears that the only sentence which relates to Applicants' previous arguments is the first full sentence on page 3 of the Office Action. This sentence states of "Iijima's teaching renders obvious the broad steps of selecting a cylinder to be cleaned, determining operating parameters, sequence to control the press using a central control system." The first step mentioned by the Examiner, "selecting a cylinder to be cleaned," was not the point of argument in the Amendment After Final. The second step mentioned by the Examiner, "determining operating parameters," is relevant only if the operating parameters are used as claimed. That is, if the operating parameters do not relate to the wash sequence, they are irrelevant. The present invention determines an optimal wash sequence based on the operating parameters. In Fig. 4 of Iijima, the wash sequence is fixed.

The third step mentioned by the Examiner "sequence to control the press using a central control system," is not completely understood. However, perhaps if the Examiner is

referring to determining an optimal wash sequence for each selected cylinder. Iijima clearly does not disclose this feature. It appears that perhaps the Examiner has overlooked this extremely important step of the invention.

Similar to the first full sentence on the page three, the remaining portions of the Office Action do not address the previous arguments. At page 3, lines 4-9, the Examiner argues that various operating parameters would have been obvious. As mentioned above, the use of operating parameters in Iijima is completely different from that claimed. For example, the fact that a control system may have information relating to the type of material to be printed is relevant only if that information is used to determine an optimal wash sequence. There is no determination of an optimal wash sequence in Iijima.

At page 3, lines 10-17 of the Office Action, the Examiner argues that performing the claimed invention automatically would have been obvious. The automatic aspects of the invention are only tangentially related to the point of novelty. Applicants' previous arguments were not based on the claimed steps being done automatically.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed the Examiner has not addressed the patentability of arguments raised in the Amendment After Final Rejection. The Examiner is requested to again review those arguments and allow the pending claims. Although a Notice of Allowance is believed to be the appropriate action, should the Examiner decide to issue a further rejection, it is believed this rejection should not be a final rejection in view of the non-responsiveness of the present Office Action.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY

By: 

Mark J. Henry

Registration No. 36,162

Suite 500  
700 Eleventh St., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 434-1500

Date: September 14, 1998